

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 739

EA 001 324

EVALUATING OPERATION LEADERSHIP--THE PRINCIPAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM, APRIL-JUNE, 1967.

BY- LORBER, NEIL M.

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

PUB DATE DEC 67

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.52 36P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PRINCIPALS, *INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, HIGH SCHOOLS, *DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS, *SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, URBAN EDUCATION, QUESTIONNAIRES, PROGRAM EVALUATION, *FIELD EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS, WORKSHOPS, CASE STUDIES (EDUCATION), SIMULATION, CONFERENCES, OBSERVATION, BROOKLYN,

IN THE SPRING OF 1967, EIGHTEEN ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS AND DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN WHO WERE AWAITING APPOINTMENTS AS PRINCIPALS OF NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS WITH A PREPONDERANCE OF DISADVANTAGED PUPILS WERE ASSIGNED TO A TEN-WEEK INTERNSHIP PROGRAM. THIS PROGRAM WAS DESIGNED TO PROVIDE THEM WITH THE OPPORTUNITY FOR CLOSE OBSERVATION OF SCHOOL OPERATIONS, FOR PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL DECISIONMAKING, AND FOR INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES, SUPERVISION, AND THE PLANNING OF IMPROVED INSTRUCTION. EACH INTERN WAS ASSIGNED TO AN EXPERIENCED AND SUCCESSFUL HOST PRINCIPAL OF A SCHOOL SERVING DISADVANTAGED PUPILS. INTERNS SPENT THREE DAYS OF EACH WEEK IN THEIR HOST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OR HIGH SCHOOL AND TWO DAYS IN SEMINARS AND WORKSHOPS. TRAINING TECHNIQUES INCLUDED OPEN-ENDED CASE STUDIES, SIMULATED PROBLEM INCIDENTS PRESENTED OVER CLOSED-CIRCUIT TELEVISION, AND FOLLOW-UP SUPPORT AFTER APPOINTMENT OF INTERNS TO PRINCIPALSHIPS. PROGRAM EVALUATION METHODS INCLUDED EXAMINATION OF THE INTERNS' LOGS, ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE REPLIES FROM INTERNS AND HOST PRINCIPALS, AND APPRAISAL OF OBSERVATIONS MADE AT WORKSHOPS, SEMINARS, AND SCHOOLS. AS CONFIRMED BY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES AND RELATED REPORTS, THE PROJECT SUCCEEDED IN PROVIDING INTERNS WITH RICH PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL EXPERIENCE IN ADVANCED ADMINISTRATIVE TRAINING AND HUMAN RELATIONS SKILLS. (JK)

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Bernard E. Donovan, Superintendent of Schools

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
J. Wayne Wrightstone, Assistant Superintendent

ED019739

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATING OPERATION LEADERSHIP—
THE PRINCIPAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

April-June, 1967

Prepared by
Neil M. Lorber

EA 001 324

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
Samuel D. McClelland, Acting Director
George Forlano, Assistant Administrative Director

December, 1967

Indebtedness is due Dr. George Forlano,
Assistant Administrative Director of the Bureau of
Educational Research, for his valued assistance in the
coordination of this research.

Appreciation is also due Mr. Carl B. Erdberg,
Coordinator of "Operation Leadership" during the period of
this evaluation, for the cooperation that he so willingly
extended to the Bureau of Educational Research and for his
contributions to the initial sections of this report.

In addition, Miss Jane Greenspan, Assistant
Coordinator of "Operation Leadership," should be thanked
for her contribution of material on interns' logs and ex-
periences.

NEIL M. LORBER
Bureau of Educational Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
THE PROGRAM	1
Introduction and Overview	1
History	2
The Interns	3
Funding	3
Personnel	4
Internships in Host Schools	4
Workshops	5
Case Studies	6
Simulations	6
The Follow-Up Supportive Program	7
The Evaluation of the Program	7
INTERNS' QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES	8
INTERNS' LOGS AND ACTIVITIES IN HOST SCHOOLS	23
Conferences	25
Observations	28
Other Activities	29
HOST PRINCIPALS' QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES	30
CONCLUDING REMARKS	32

THE PROGRAM

Introduction and Overview

On April 17, 1967, the Office of Personnel of the New York City Board of Education initiated a program of principal internship for eighteen assistant principals and chairmen of departments. These intermediate supervisors had passed examinations for school principalships and were awaiting appointment. Deputy Superintendent Theodore H. Lang requested an evaluation of this innovation in administrative training. The evaluation was assigned to the Bureau of Educational Research. This report surveys the findings of the evaluation.

The purpose of the internship program was to provide training for licensed principals awaiting appointment to schools with a preponderance of disadvantaged pupils. It sought to provide them with the opportunity for the close observation of school operations, for participation in school decision-making, and for involvement in community activities, supervision, and the planning of improved instruction.

All of the eighteen principal interns in the program in the Spring of 1967 were expected to receive appointments during the 1967-1968 school year. Thus, their internship experience immediately preceded their appointment. The initial cycle of the program was conducted by the Office of Personnel from April 17, 1967 to June 30, 1967, a period of two and one-half months. Another cycle is in operation this year, involving a new group of interns. Only the initial cycle of the program, however, is discussed and evaluated in this report. Though remarks in the report may often also apply to current aspects of the program, they intend, specifically, to refer to its

operation in the Spring of 1967.

Each of the eighteen participants in the program was assigned to an experienced "host principal" selected on the basis of outstanding performance as the head of a school serving disadvantaged pupils. Each intern reported to his host principal's school throughout the duration of the program. In addition to absorbing outstanding practices in their "host schools," the interns were encouraged to plan the use of creative techniques (to be used in their own future schools) which would seek to provide effective compensatory education for disadvantaged pupils.

To insure a complete and realistic orientation for the interns, the program featured collateral talks, seminars, and other forms of direct communication designed to give a comprehensive cross-section of community life and thought. These contacts involved community leaders, anti-poverty forces, civil rights groups, and other grass-roots representation. They also involved Board of Education and local college and university personnel. The main purpose of the seminars was to acquaint the interns with the thinking of people who had special insights into the successful operation of schools in disadvantaged areas. The seminars were held twice a week.

History

The Office of Personnel had experimented with a principal internship program using two selected interns assigned to two selected high schools in September, 1966. A committee worked closely with the two interns and host principals to prepare a set of guidelines for the program. The purpose of the guidelines was to give direction to the interns and host principals. The guidelines aimed to help them derive the maximum training potential inherent in their unique working relationship. The program itself was

designed to provide quality leadership for quality education.

The Interns

Of the eighteen interns, fourteen were assistant principals awaiting assignment as principals of elementary schools and four were high school department chairmen about to be appointed as high school principals. The professional backgrounds of the assistant principals were varied. Some were appointed to elementary schools in middle-class areas, some were appointed to junior high schools in middle-class areas, and some were appointed to junior high schools in disadvantaged areas.

A major purpose of the program was to provide interns with training in the administration of schools in economically disadvantaged areas. The "host schools" to which the interns were assigned were, as noted, therefore located in low income areas, drawing their entire student body from low income families. The Office of Personnel considered that, although the eighteen interns had demonstrated their professional abilities in being certified as principals, one more dimension of experience was necessary before they assumed the principalship of schools in blighted areas. Urban school problems in such areas have proved themselves to be so difficult and complex that the utmost of skill is demanded of educational leaders in order to cope with them. The internship, it was assumed, would help to provide principals who would have the necessary understandings, skills, and sophistication to meet the critical needs of these communities.

Funding

The principals of the interns' home schools were instructed to assign "acting supervisors" taken from the classroom to replace the interns in

their absence. Substitute teachers were employed to take the classroom positions of the staff members who were made acting supervisors.

The salaries and welfare benefits of the interns were paid for by funds received from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. \$80,000 was allotted for this purpose. In addition, the Higher Education Division of the New York State Education Department allotted \$20,000 for consultation fees, seminars, and general administrative expenses. Thus, the entire budget for the two and one-half months program amounted to \$100,000.

Personnel

The program was administered by a coordinator, an assistant coordinator, and a secretary. The coordinator was a well-experienced supervisor who held licenses as a principal on the elementary, junior high school, and high school levels. The assistant coordinator was a trainee in personnel examining certified by the New York City Department of Personnel and on assignment to the Department of Personnel of the Board of Education.

Internships in Host Schools

Interns spent three days a week in their host schools. The two remaining days were given over to seminars and workshops. A list of their combined estimates of the time they spent in their host schools on major topical areas of the program follows:

<u>Area</u>	<u>Percent of Time Spent in Host Schools</u>
I Setting an Effective School Tone	10%
II Relations with Staff	18%
III Relations with Community	14%
IV Helping Children with Special Needs	9%
V Curriculum and Instruction	21%
VI School Organization	13%
VII Relations with Higher Authority	6%
VIII Integration	9%

The interns, as indicated, gained experience in all of the major topical areas of the program, though in varying degrees of depth or intensity. In addition to spending time in their host schools, the interns visited schools in their districts and observed special Board of Education experimental programs (e.g., the Initial Teaching Alphabet program, the Responsive Environment [Talking Typewriter] program, the More Effective Schools program, and the Non-Graded Elementary Schools program).

Workshops

After the morning seminars and a lunch period, the interns reconvened for workshops. A good part of each workshop session was devoted to relating the content of the morning seminar session to the role of the principal in a disadvantaged area. In addition, the interns shared their experiences in their host schools with each other. They also discussed literature and research on teaching disadvantaged pupils in an urban setting.

The program coordinator acted as a resource person at the workshops, circulating from one group to the next and offering the interns the benefit

of his experience and background. There was discussion of the implications of decentralization in the New York City Public School System and how it would effect school principals. For example, the new practice of a principal having to appear before a local school board before his assignment to a school was discussed.

Case Studies

Each intern was required to prepare a description of a critical incident occurring in a school. The incidents they described were discussed in the workshops. It was planned to edit them for use with future interns and for use in the in-service training of incumbent principals. The case studies were left "open-ended" (in "unfinished story" fashion) with discussants giving their own solutions to the problems.

Simulations

Closed-circuit television (at the audio-visual center at Brooklyn College) was employed to present simulations of incidents which might occur in the schools of newly-appointed principals in disadvantaged areas. The incidents had been developed by a team of four college professors who had extensive experience with the simulation technique. The interns took the role of the newly-appointed principal. Their reactions to the incidents, and the decisions that they made, were discussed by the other interns after they had watched the scenario over closed-circuit T.V.

The use of the simulation technique was experimental. Its major purpose was to assess its potential for the future training of interns and principals-in-service.

The Follow-Up Supportive Program

The Office of Personnel planned to provide supportive help to interns after their appointment to principalships. The following means were among those considered. All of these supportive services resulted from the examination of the suggestions made by program participants:

1. The exchange of supervisory and administrative materials between heads of schools who had been interns (e.g., minutes of faculty conferences).
2. The distribution to former interns of minutes of seminar sessions of current and future principal-intern programs.
3. Visits by the program coordinator to the schools of former interns.
4. Monthly workshops for principals who had been former interns.

The Evaluation of the Program

The objectives of the survey and assessment of the program included the determination of important aspects of the growth and development of the principal-designates and the determination of the nature and scope of the activities they engaged in. The evaluation objectives also included determination of principal-designates' familiarity with educational and sociological problems peculiar to disadvantaged children. Interns' reactions to the program, as well as those of their host principals, were also sought.

The evaluation plans included the examination of interns' logs, the analysis of questionnaire replies from interns and host principals, and the appraisal of observations made at workshops, seminars, and schools.

INTERNS' QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Interns' reactions to the program were solicited by means of a comprehensive questionnaire. The questionnaire was anonymous. All eighteen participants in the program completed questionnaires. In addition, questionnaires were returned by three acting principals who, though excused from assignments to host schools, attended the program seminars. No replies to items relating to host school experiences, of course, were available from this group.

The interns responded to all objective questions by circling the appropriate rating (1 to 5) according to the following five-point scale:

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - A slight extent
- 3 - A moderate extent
- 4 - An appreciable extent
- 5 - An exceptional extent

The interns' responses to questionnaire items are presented in this section of the report. The percent of interns applying each of the above ratings in making their replies is stated. Median scale ratings are also reported. The significance of individual percents indicated should be viewed in light of the small number of principal interns participating in the program; much more significance should therefore be attached to medians reported than to individual statements of percents.

In addition to statements on percents and medians, the extent to which interns' opinions tended to be in agreement (consistent with each other) is indicated. These statements appear where their responses reflect a very high consensus (80 percent or more of their replies in 2 contiguous categories), a high consensus (85 percent or more of their replies in 3 contiguous categories), or a moderate consensus (75 to 84 percent of their replies in 3 contiguous categories).

The interns were asked the following questions:

SCALE

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
1. To what extent was the program of value to you in meeting your individual needs as a future principal?	0%	0%	9%	68%	23%
Median scale rating: 4					Very high consensus
2. To what extent did it prepare you to handle school problem situations and decision-making?	0%	0%	32%	59%	9%
Median scale rating: 4					Very high consensus
3. To what extent did the program alter your viewpoints on school administration in underprivileged areas?	0%	9%	41%	36%	14%
Median scale rating: 3.5					High consensus
4. To what extent did it lead you to re-view and evaluate your conception and understanding of the role, status, and position of the school principal?	5%	5%	23%	36%	31%
Median scale rating: 4					High consensus
5. To what extent did the program stimulate creative and independent thinking?	0%	5%	24%	38%	33%
Median scale rating: 4					High consensus
6. To what extent did the program help you to become more secure as a school administrator?	27%	14%	18%	32%	9%
Median scale rating: 3					
7. To what extent did the program increase your leadership ability?	5%	19%	19%	52%	5%
Median scale rating: 4					High consensus
8. To what extent did it enhance your supervisory skills?	9%	18%	50%	18%	5%
Median scale rating: 3					High consensus

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - A slight extent
- 3 - A moderate extent
- 4 - An appreciable extent
- 5 - An exceptional extent

The interns were also asked to indicate the extent to which the program enhanced their understanding and perspective regarding certain major administrative concerns and enhanced their ability to deal with them. A list of their replies follows:

	<u>SCALE</u>				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
1. Relations with higher authority.	14%	0%	33%	43%	10%
Median scale rating: 4					High consensus
2. School integration problems.	0%	5%	10%	48%	37%
Median scale rating: 4					Very high consensus
3. Relations with the community (e.g., communicating with parent and professional groups).	0%	5%	19%	43%	33%
Median scale rating: 4					High consensus
4. Evaluating and improving curriculum and instruction.	5%	29%	33%	19%	14%
Median scale rating: 3					Moderate consensus
5. School organization.	10%	19%	19%	47%	5%
Median scale rating: 4					High consensus
6. Making provision for children with special needs.	5%	24%	38%	33%	0%
Median scale rating: 3					High consensus
7. Giving class assignments to teachers.	5%	37%	29%	24%	5%
Median scale rating: 3					High consensus
8. U.F.T. relations.	0%	10%	38%	33%	19%
Median scale rating: 4					High consensus
9. Introducing innovative educational procedures (e.g., new teaching techniques, programmed instruction).	10%	10%	24%	42%	14%
Median scale rating: 4					Moderate consensus

SCALE

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
10. Improving academic achievement levels. Median scale rating: 3	5%	24%	33%	33%	5%
			Moderate consensus		
11. Maintaining staff morale (e.g., resolving personal problems and grievances). Median scale rating: 4	0%	19%	19%	43%	19%
			Moderate consensus		
12. Assessing teacher performance. Median scale rating: 3	10%	19%	47%	24%	0%
			High consensus		
13. Working with minority group children. Median scale rating: 4	0%	5%	19%	47%	29%
			High consensus		
14. Making provision for non-English speaking pupils. Median scale rating: 3	14%	10%	33%	43%	0%
			High consensus		
15. Utilizing cluster teachers, O.T.P.'s, and school aides. Median scale rating: 4	10%	10%	19%	51%	10%
			Moderate consensus		
16. Providing special pupil services (lunch, transportation, etc.). Median scale rating: 3	19%	19%	43%	19%	0%
			Moderate consensus		
17. Insuring pupil safety. Median scale rating: 3	24%	19%	33%	19%	5%
			Moderate consensus		
18. Providing school guidance and disciplinary services. Median scale rating: 3	14%	10%	56%	10%	10%
			Moderate consensus		
19. Maintaining a good school image. Median scale rating: 4	0%	10%	5%	38%	47%
			Very high consensus		
20. Assisting teacher growth and development (e.g., training new teachers). Median scale rating: 3	5%	19%	29%	37%	10%
			High consensus		

SCALE

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
21. Evaluating the means and methods of school supervision.	5%	10%	29%	51%	5%
Median scale rating: 4				Very high consensus	
22. Evaluating organizational effectiveness.	5%	5%	14%	71%	5%
Median scale rating: 4				Very high consensus	
23. Delegating staff responsibilities.	0%	18%	24%	29%	29%
Median scale rating: 4				Moderate consensus	
24. Planning and conducting staff meetings.	14%	10%	52%	24%	0%
Median scale rating: 3				High consensus	
25. Techniques of group decision-making.	0%	10%	32%	48%	10%
Median scale rating: 4				Very high consensus	
26. Allocating time and resources.	5%	19%	29%	42%	5%
Median scale rating: 3				High consensus	
27. Establishing effective communication networks within the school.	5%	14%	33%	38%	10%
Median scale rating: 3				High consensus	
28. Planning and establishing goal priorities.	5%	14%	24%	38%	19%
Median scale rating: 4				Moderate consensus	

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - A slight extent
- 3 - A moderate extent
- 4 - An appreciable extent
- 5 - An exceptional extent

The interns were also asked the following question, under which their replies are reported:

To what extent did the program enhance your understanding and perspective regarding the following problems and your ability to deal with them:

	<u>SCALE</u>				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
1. Irrate parents.	10%	5%	38%	33%	14%
Median scale rating: 3		High consensus			
2. Suspense cases.	10%	10%	42%	28%	10%
Median scale rating: 3		Moderate consensus			
3. Having to give an unsatisfactory rating to a teacher.	19%	14%	38%	24%	5%
Median scale rating: 3		Moderate consensus			
4. Selecting an acting supervisor.	10%	19%	52%	19%	
Median scale rating: 3		High consensus			
5. Teacher complaints about duty assignments.	24%	5%	38%	33%	0%
Median scale rating: 3		Moderate consensus			
6. Recruiting new personnel in a school with high teacher turnover.	5%	29%	38%	14%	14%
Median scale rating: 3		Moderate consensus			
7. Parental requests for the special placement of pupils.	14%	24%	33%	24%	5%
Median scale rating: 3		Moderate consensus			
8. Criticisms of the school curriculum.	0%	19%	33%	43%	5%
Median scale rating: 3		High consensus			

	<u>SCALE</u>				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
9. Pupil demands for "freedoms" (speech, dress, etc.).	29%	14%	38%	19%	0%
Median scale rating: 3			Moderate consensus		
10. Criticism of the materials of instruction.	5%	19%	47%	29%	0%
Median scale rating: 3			High consensus		
11. A parent complaint sent to the District Superintendent concerning the school program.	14%	10%	43%	28%	5%
Median scale rating: 3			Moderate consensus		
12. A threatened parent boycott.	24%	10%	38%	24%	4%
Median scale rating: 3					

In addition, the interns were asked to evaluate certain program activities and experiences as preparation for their future principalships. Their replies follow:

	<u>Of little or no value or practical use</u>	<u>Valuable learning experience but of little practical use</u>	<u>Valuable learning experience and of practical use</u>
1. Seminars.	0%	5%	95%
2. Afternoon workshops.	0%	6%	94%
3. Internship in host school.	0%	11%	89%
4. Visits to Special Service Schools.	0%	6%	94%
5. Visits to schools with special experimental programs.	7%	13%	80%
6. Simulation exercises.	35%	20%	45%
7. Making case studies.	28%	39%	33%
8. Keeping logs.	26%	42%	32%
9. Reading and reporting on important books.	5%	37%	58%

The interns were also asked to appraise the time allotted to these activities and experiences. Their responses are reported below:

	<u>Too little time</u>	<u>Sufficient time</u>	<u>Too much time</u>
1. Seminars.	10%	90%	0%
2. Afternoon workshops.	11%	84%	5%
3. Internship in host school.	16%	37%	47%
4. Visits to Special Service Schools.	53%	40%	7%
5. Visits to schools with special experimental programs.	59%	35%	6%
6. Simulation exercises.	47%	18%	35%
7. Making case studies.	11%	78%	11%
8. Keeping logs.	0%	79%	21%
9. Reading and reporting on important books.	17%	72%	11%

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - A slight extent
- 3 - A moderate extent
- 4 - An appreciable extent
- 5 - An exceptional extent

In addition, the interns were presented with the following question, under which their replies are reported:

In terms of your future role as a principal in an underprivileged community, to what extent did the program increase your understanding and perspective regarding:

	<u>SCALE</u>				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
1. The meaning of education to the underprivileged community.	5%	0%	0%	43%	52%
Median scale rating: 5					Very high consensus
2. The philosophy, type, content, and structure of the educational program required to meet the needs of the underprivileged community.	5%	0%	0%	71%	24%
Median scale rating: 4					Very high consensus

		<u>SCALE</u>				
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
3. The problems and social-cultural needs of the underprivileged community.	5%	0%	5%	43%	47%	
Median scale rating: 4		Very high consensus				
4. The culture and temperament of the underprivileged community (e.g., attitudes, sentiments).	5%	0%	14%	33%	48%	
Median scale rating: 4		Very high consensus				
5. The criticisms of education, the school, and the school system that emanate from the underprivileged community.	5%	5%	10%	38%	42%	
Median scale rating: 4		Very high consensus				
6. Better ways, as a principal, of developing sound, desirable and effective rapport with underprivileged people.	0%	10%	14%	33%	43%	
Median scale rating: 4		High consensus				
7. The difficulties and inadequacies that principals face in effectively relating to underprivileged people.	4%	0%	10%	43%	43%	
Median scale rating: 4		Very high consensus				
8. Better ways of improving communication, understanding, and exchange between the principal and parents in the underprivileged community.	5%	14%	0%	29%	52%	
Median scale rating: 5		Very high consensus				
9. Principles, policies, and procedures the school can apply to meet the needs of underprivileged pupils.	5%	5%	14%	52%	24%	
Median scale rating: 4		High consensus				
10. Effective ways of motivating underprivileged children to educational achievement.	5%	5%	52%	38%	0%	
Median scale rating: 3		Very high consensus				
11. Effective ways of gaining parent understanding, interest, contributions, and cooperation in school matters.	4%	4%	30%	38%	24%	
Median scale rating: 4		High consensus				

	<u>SCALE</u>				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
12. Barriers between middle class and underprivileged people. Median scale rating: 4	9%	5%	19%	38%	29%
				High consensus	
13. Ways the school can become constructively involved in community activities. Median scale rating: 4	0%	9%	23%	45%	23%
				High consensus	
14. The reception parents in the underprivileged community expect of the school (e.g., displays of courtesy and respect). Median scale rating: 4.5	5%	0%	9%	36%	50%
				Very high consensus	
15. The program, policies, and methods desired and promoted by the underprivileged community for improving the quality of education. Median scale rating: 4	3%	5%	32%	42%	18%
				High consensus	

The interns were also asked the following questions on their internship experience in their host schools:

To what extent did your internship in your host school entail:

Observing school operations and functioning. Median scale rating: 5	0%	0%	0%	28%	72%
				Very high consensus	
Participating in administrative decision-making. Median scale rating: 3	6%	18%	41%	24%	11%
				Moderate consensus	
Meeting with parents. Median scale rating: 4	6%	17%	24%	47%	6%
				High consensus	
Involvement in community activities. Median scale rating: 2	18%	35%	24%	18%	5%
				Moderate consensus	
Planning, improving, and supervising instruction. Median scale rating: 3	11%	6%	47%	18%	18%
				Moderate consensus	

	<u>SCALE</u>				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Resolving school problems.	6%	12%	58%	18%	6%
Median scale rating: 3			High consensus		
Attending faculty conferences.	13%	31%	25%	25%	6%
Median scale rating: 3			Moderate consensus		
To what extent did your association with your host principal constitute a close, working relationship?	0%	0%	0%	29%	71%
Median scale rating: 5			Very high consensus		
To what extent did your host principal introduce you to administrative and supervisory skills and techniques?	0%	0%	0%	59%	41%
Median scale rating: 4			Very high consensus		
To what extent was your concept of the principal's role modified by your internship with your host principal?	6%	0%	29%	53%	12%
Median scale rating: 4			Very high consensus		
To what extent was your understanding of the ways a principal should handle daily problems advanced?	0%	5%	12%	71%	12%
Median scale rating: 4			Very high consensus		
To what extent were you provided opportunity for innovative thinking and planning?	0%	18%	52%	12%	18%
Median scale rating: 3			Moderate consensus		
To what extent were the operations of your host school explained to you?	0%	0%	6%	53%	41%
Median scale rating: 4			Very high consensus		

In addition, the interns were asked to indicate specific ways in which the program was of greatest benefit to them. Their individual replies on the matter

are reported below. These are stated in paraphrased and quoted form.

The program provided opportunity for the exchange of ideas and for the refinement of administrative thinking. It provided opportunity for the development of good peer relations with people "in the same boat." It provided an opportunity to become conversant (to a degree) with the thinking of people outside the school system but whose activities directly and indirectly affect the schools. We learned many new ideas to think about.

The program afforded us an opportunity to assess the points of view of parents and community leaders. My host principal demonstrated alternate ways of arriving at desirable goals. My exposure to certain specific procedures developed in my host school was of great value.

The program provided us with the opportunity to see the day-to-day operation of the principal's office, the opportunity to see the methods used to build school morale, and the opportunity to study important documents and books, etc.

The program gave us an overall view of education in all areas of the city. It provided us with an opportunity to hold discussions with noted members of the Board of Education and of the community. It enabled us to meet with other interns for mutual give-and-take. It provided us with the opportunity to think creatively without the usual pressures.

The program broadened our view of the school system and its workings. It gave us information regarding the help we might expect from headquarters. It provided us with greater insight into the concerns of minority groups and greater insight into possible ways to work constructively with these groups. It afforded

us the opportunity to share our ideas with our colleagues.

The program led us to greater understanding of the needs and aspirations of the socially deprived. It stressed the need for effective communication with teachers, pupils, and the community. It stressed the need for flexible, open approaches. It provided us with up-to-date information of value to educators. It increased our awareness of the broad spectrum of the principal's responsibilities. This was of great benefit, as were the insights the program provided into relationships between the problems of individual schools and the problems of the Board of Education. The program increased our awareness of the complexity of school problems. This was also of much value.

The program increased our insight into behavior. This was of benefit, as was the opportunity to share our ideas with our colleagues. The program also gave us the opportunity to listen and speak to community leaders and exchange our points of view. This was very valuable. The chance the program gave us to hear and speak to Board of Education personnel in small group situations was also very important, as was the opportunity it gave us to become more sophisticated about community problems and the role of the community in the school.

Important aspects of the program included the chance it gave us to listen to speakers in various fields, to study and observe new programs and approaches, and to witness and examine an elementary school in action.

Taking part in the seminar programs afforded us an opportunity to listen

to, and exchange views with, people from various agencies involved in the field of education. Being able to spend some time at the schools to which we will be appointed was also very beneficial.

The exchange of ideas and information with fellow interns was beneficial. The seminars were stimulating. The questions and discussions presented new avenues of thinking.

The program provided me with more confidence in my ability to face the tasks that a principal in a special service school is likely to meet. Exposure to the seminar speakers was of great value, as were the follow-up discussions.

The program gave me an opportunity to rethink many of the ideas I previously held. Some of them were modified as a result of the experience.

The program gave me insight into what I can expect from parents and the community. I was able to visit a variety of schools and, thus, was able to benefit from numerous viewpoints expressed and evidenced. The program gave me guidance which will help me to avoid the pitfalls that a neophyte is prone to.

Most of my experience has been outside of the special service schools. The program therefore served to introduce me to many problems in such schools. I also became familiar with different approaches to teaching, guidance, administration, and community involvement. I became more knowledgeable regarding such problems as staff fluidity and teacher training.

The greatest benefit of the program was that it gave us sufficient time to read, to think, to discuss, and to evaluate many different ideas. It gave us an opportunity to visit various areas and schools and to see and compare various educational approaches. I think the real value of the program will become known to me when I am faced with problems in my own school. I shall then have a feeling of security resulting from my vicarious experiences in the program. Also, I believe the friendships I have made will be of lasting value to me.

My experience has been solely in the junior high schools. The program was therefore of great value to me as it acquainted me with many aspects of school administration at other educational levels.

Since I was able to visit the school in which I will be a principal several times, I feel that I am in a much stronger position to take over my new responsibilities there.

The program helped me to obtain greater insight into the feelings of the community and to grasp the public pulse. This meant a great deal to me in terms of my being able to ascertain my future problems. I was also able to observe many new programs which gave me food for thought, as well as many ideas I may wish to try in the near future.

The program gave me a chance to "live" in an elementary school (I have only had junior high school experience). It provided me with an opportunity to exchange views with colleagues and to exchange views with "authorities." Being able to become something of a "student" again also had much value.

The following criticism of the program was stated:

I thought the simulation exercises were of little value. I felt they were superfluous to our aims. The same thing could have been accomplished through interns' sharing of common problems.

INTERNS' LOGS AND ACTIVITIES IN HOST SCHOOLS

The interns were requested to keep logs on their activities in their host schools. The logs recorded in minute detail the various activities in which they were involved. In general, the logs revealed that the interns engaged primarily in observations and conferences. It was, however, difficult to determine the extent of their involvement in these activities. The single activity most frequently engaged in by the interns appeared to be classroom and teacher observation.

The basic variations among the interns in their field experience related to (1) their contacts with people and (2) the variety of programs and organizational set-ups they observed. For example, junior high school interns spent a great deal of time with department chairmen (who, of course, are not employed in elementary schools).

The time the interns spent in their host schools was not uniform. The amount of time they spent visiting other schools in their districts also varied. Most of the interns worked on a special major project in their schools.

Each intern was given a set of guidelines to use in planning his activities in his host school. The guidelines outlined procedures suggesting ways for the interns to become involved in learning activities of importance to a principal.

In addition to their use in determining the nature and scope of the

interns' activities in their host schools, daily logs were used to assess the extent to which the interns followed the guidelines. While each intern could not engage in all of the activities suggested in the guidelines, the logs revealed that the activities were encompassed by the broad experiences of the group. The following discussion serves to illustrate this point.

Under the guideline heading, Setting an Effective School Tone, suggested procedures included: (1) attending parent association meetings, (2) conferences with parents, and (3) conferences with teachers. Most of the interns had several conferences with teachers after classroom observations (speaking with them alone or observing the host principal conducting the discussion). Several interns had conferences with individual parents regarding student discipline problems or parent grievances. One intern undertook the reorganization of the parent association in his host school as a major project.

Under the guideline topic, Relations with the Staff, the following procedures were among those outlined: (1) meetings with the principal and various staff groups and (2) becoming familiar with grievance decisions and various pertinent documents. The interns were frequently participant-observers at conferences held by the principal with the school's staff. They made formal contacts with key personnel in the schools. They read grievance decisions as well as contracts and handbooks governing various groups (e.g., custodians, secretaries).

In the area, How to Deal with Children with Special Problems, the interns worked on the development of creative-enrichment experiences in I.G.C. classes. Many conferred with personnel in charge of special programs, such as the C.R.M.D. program and Junior Guidance program. One intern's host school received most of the physically handicapped and retarded children in his district; he was therefore able to observe how the needs of these children were being met.

In regard to Curriculum and Instruction (another major area outlined in the guidelines), interns met with district coordinators to learn about new curriculum and methods. They were able, for example, to observe team teaching. Several were involved in programming cluster teachers and team teachers. As a major project, one intern chose the revision of the school curriculum. Another developed a set of minimal grade goals in language arts. Several interns analyzed and interpreted reading scores and planned programs to improve reading skills. Interns spent the greatest portion of their time in the area of curriculum and teacher observation. Many of them gave demonstration lessons.

School Organization was another major area in the guidelines. Almost all of the interns worked with the staff of the host school on reorganization and program planning for September, 1967. A few interns observed their host principals interviewing applicants for teaching positions. Many interns assisted new teachers with classroom organization, record keeping, teaching techniques, etc. A large number of host principals invited their interns to district principals meetings and other district-wide conferences. One intern worked on plans for a school modernization program; another was involved in work regarding the opening of a new school annex.

An attempt is made below to categorize the interns' host school experiences as they were revealed by their logs. The data are reported in tabular form.

Conferences

Conferences in which the interns were involved aimed at exchanging and sharing information. They involved various professional and community personnel. The interns became acquainted with many people in their host schools and districts and held many informal talks with them. Table 1 reflects their most important meetings. Conferences at which the interns were observers rather

than participants are reported in Table 2.

Table 1: Conferences

<u>Conferences Held By Interns With:</u>	<u>Number of Interns Reporting the Ex- perience (N=17)</u>	<u>Number of Interns Frequently Report- ing the Experience</u>
Teachers	11	1
Principals	17	1
Parent association members	5	0
Individual parents	6	0
Guidance staff members	11	0
Cabinet members	6	0
District personnel	7	0
District Principals	5	0
Assistant Principals and Administrative Assistants	7	0
Other school personnel	13	0
UFT chapter chairmen	3	0

As would be expected, all the interns conferred with their host principals. A close working relationship between the two was a positive outgrowth of the program. Most of the interns tried to get a picture of the functions of key personnel in their host schools, such as Assistant Principals, Administrative Assistants, department chairmen, and guidance counselors. They also observed the functioning of librarians, custodians, dieticians, attendance teachers, grade advisors, and school secretaries. Among the district personnel with whom the interns conferred were District Superintendents, school-community coordinators, Human Relations Committee members, and subject area coordinators.

As experienced assistant principals and department chairmen, the interns

had previously worked with many of the above-mentioned individuals. As interns, however, their contacts with them involved a greater degree of fact-finding and information gathering.

Among the content of conferences with host principals mentioned by the interns was teacher rating and observation, the selection of key personnel for the new term, organization and programming for the new term, parent grievances, UFT contracts, the position of the UFT chapter chairman, procedural information, interns' backgrounds and major projects, problems faced by new principals, seminars attended by the interns, and various conferences attended by both the principals and the interns. Several interns, however, did not discuss the content of conferences with their host principals in their logs.

Assistant principals and administrative assistants were called upon by the interns for information regarding (1) the way that classes were covered during teacher absences, (2) the use of cluster teachers, per diem teachers, and school aides, (3) teacher evaluations, (4) the preparation of end-term calendars, (5) accident reports, (6) handling discipline problems, and (7) supervisory practices.

After classroom observations, the interns reviewed and evaluated teachers' lessons with them. Those interns who chose curriculum programs for a major project sometimes worked with teachers on them. Those who were involved in organization and programming for the new term also had a good deal of contact with teachers. Interns also discussed parent grievances with teachers and sometimes spoke with individual parents regarding children with special problems. They met with groups of parents at parent association meetings, including executive board sessions. One intern met with parents on various grade levels to discuss homework assignments.

Observations

Observations helped the interns to find out how various things were being done. The interns sat in on conferences between host principals and parent association members, principals and assistant principals, teachers and parents, host principals and teachers seeking positions, principals and UFT chapter chairmen, and, very frequently, principals and parents.

Table 2: Observations

<u>Observations</u>	<u>Number of Interns Reporting the Ex- perience (N=17)</u>	<u>Number of Interns Frequently Report- ing the Experience</u>
Routines	14	0
Assembly programs	9	0
Classrooms and teachers	15	5
Special programs	13	0
Pupil suspension hearings	9	0
Handling of problems by Principals and Assistant Principals	9	0
Conferences	17	3

The interns were afforded the opportunity to observe principals in action and to follow their decision-making and problem solving techniques. The following problems faced by principals were noted: (1) dissatisfied parents, (2) pupil discipline, (3) guidance cases, (4) teacher training, (5) classroom coverage, (6) intruders, and (7) vandalism. Through their close association with their host principals, the interns were able to gain increased awareness of the ways that principals can handle such problems. They obtained many ideas regarding their own approach to them, as well as developing a sound basis for evaluating their own administrative style and methods.

Interns observed special programs operating in their host schools, increasing their knowledge of the nature of such programs and the various ways of organizing and conducting them. Although the same programs may have been operating in their home schools, they were often run differently there than they were in their host schools. Some of the special programs listed by the interns in their logs involved pre-kindergarten classes, Junior Guidance classes, CRMD classes, reading clinics, programmed instruction, team teaching, and the use of cluster teachers. Included in the item, "Routines" (see Table 2) was morning line-up, afternoon line-up and dismissal, lunchroom procedures, yard duty and organization, and fire drills.

Other Activities

In addition to conferences and observations, other activities were reported by the interns in their logs. The most common ones they noted are listed in Table 3.

Table 3: Other Activities

<u>Other Activities</u>	<u>Number of Interns Reporting the Ex- perience (N=17)</u>	<u>Number of Interns Frequently Report- ing the Experience</u>
Visits to other schools	17	1
Work on major projects	8	5
Tours of the building	12	3
Work on school organization and programming for the next school year	12	0
Work on the end-term calendar	9	0
Reading of daily mail	3	0
Reading circulars, documents, handbooks, etc.	4	0
Analyzing test results	3	0
Tours of areas around the school	2	0
Others	10	1

Visits to other schools, while part of the field experience, were not part of the work in host schools. They were a separate aspect of the total program. The item, "Others," listed in the table, includes registering new children, assuming the duties of the Assistant Principal or Principal during their absence, teacher training, and the supervision of school aides.

HOST PRINCIPALS' QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

In cooperation with the program, "host principals" opened their schools to the principal interns. As in the case of interns, each of the host principals was asked to respond to a questionnaire. Sixteen of the eighteen host principals (89 percent) returned completed questionnaires. Their replies to the various items on the questionnaire are indicated below in percents. Median scale ratings are also reported. As to the significance of the percents indicated, they should be viewed in light of the small number of host principals participating in the program. Much more significance, therefore, lies in medians reported than in individual statements of percents.

In addition to statements on percents and medians, the extent to which host principals' opinions tended to be in agreement (consistent with each other) is indicated. These statements appear where their responses reflect a very high consensus (80 percent or more of their replies in 2 contiguous categories), a high consensus (85 percent or more of their replies in 3 contiguous categories), or a moderate consensus (75 to 84 percent of their replies in 3 contiguous categories).

- 1 - Not at all
- 2 - A slight extent
- 3 - A moderate extent
- 4 - An appreciable extent
- 5 - An exceptional extent

SCALE

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
In terms of your intern's apparent growth, to what extent do you feel the program was effective and successful?	0%	0%	25%	44%	31%

Median scale rating: 4

High consensus

To what extent do you feel your intern will be more prepared to be a principal in a disadvantaged area due to his internship experience in your school?	0%	6%	6%	57%	31%
---	----	----	----	-----	-----

Median scale rating: 4

Very high consensus

To what extent do you feel you helped your intern learn to deal with minority groups?	13%	0%	31%	31%	25%
---	-----	----	-----	-----	-----

Median scale rating: 4

High consensus

In terms of the learnings, activities, and experiences that you provided for your intern, to what extent was his ability to deal with the following administrative concerns enhanced?

Developing an effective school tone.	0%	6%	27%	47%	20%
--------------------------------------	----	----	-----	-----	-----

Median scale rating: 4

High consensus

Improving staff relations.	0%	6%	27%	47%	20%
----------------------------	----	----	-----	-----	-----

Median scale rating: 4

High consensus

Improving relations with the community.	0%	7%	13%	73%	7%
---	----	----	-----	-----	----

Median scale rating: 4

Very high consensus

Meeting the special needs of exceptional children.	0%	0%	29%	64%	7%
--	----	----	-----	-----	----

Median scale rating: 4

Very high consensus

Improving curriculum and instruction.	7%	0%	53%	27%	13%
---------------------------------------	----	----	-----	-----	-----

Median scale rating: 3

Very high consensus

Improving school organization.	14%	0%	21%	58%	7%
--------------------------------	-----	----	-----	-----	----

Median scale rating: 4

High consensus

SCALE

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Improving relations with higher authority.	21%	7%	36%	29%	7%

Median scale rating: 3

Implementing integration programs and policies.	0%	21%	36%	29%	14%
---	----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Median scale rating: 3

High consensus

What proportion (using a base of 100) of the intern's time in your school was allotted to independent pursuits and activities?	0 to <u>20%</u>	21 to <u>40%</u>	41 to <u>60%</u>	61 to <u>80%</u>	81 to <u>100%</u>
	23%	38%	31%	8%	0%

Median scale rating: 21 to 40%

High consensus

Please check one of the following appraisals of the internship phase of the program:

It should continue as is (little or no modification needed)	36%
It should be somewhat modified	57%
It needs major revision	7%
It should be dropped entirely	0%

Should an administrative internship program be planned for assistant principals in disadvantaged schools who have not taken principals' examinations?

Yes: 47% Uncertain: 20% No: 33%

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As a rule, questionnaire items required program participants to indicate the extent to which certain positive qualities were characteristic of the program

and certain positive elements were present in it. Median scale responses to the items (standard measures of the typical character of responses) were most usually 3's ("a moderate extent") or 4's ("an appreciable extent"), predominantly the latter. In the few exceptions to this rule, median scale ratings were 5 ("an exceptional extent"). In light of the data obtained, the program was more than moderately successful in achieving most of its stated objectives; it has satisfactorily fulfilled its intention of providing a beneficial, useful, and rewarding experience in administrative self-enhancement to its participants. This finding gains increased support from the wide scope of topical areas assessed by items in the questionnaire.

Additionally, in light of the depth and breadth of the program's significant learning experiences and activities in school administration indicated by the survey, the project has succeeded in providing interns with a rich professional and personal experience in advanced administrative training and human relations skills and understandings. This finding is supported by questionnaire responses as well as by reports on experiences and activities in interns' daily logs.

In a comprehensive review of interns' experiences in host schools, it is recommended that they be assigned more clearly-defined objectives in their major projects. Consideration should also be given to extending them more decision-making opportunity. In addition, the interns should be encouraged to record in greater detail the specific activities entered in their daily logs. The importance of their field experiences in helping them develop leadership style deserves continued recognition.